

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000200310066-7

Treaty

By JOSEPH A. L. STERN

(Washington Bureau of The Sun)

Washington, Sept. 8.—President Kennedy will meet with Senate leaders at the White House tomorrow just an hour before debate begins on the limited test-ban treaty.

His conference with Senator Mansfield (D., Mont.), majority leader, and Senator Dirksen (R., Ill.), minority leader, is part of an Administration drive to maintain solid bipartisan support for the test ban in the face of growing last-minute opposition.

Most indicators still point toward approval of the pact without any amendments of reservations that would require new negotiations with the Soviet Union and other treaty signers.

Report Opposes Pact

One adverse factor for the Administration is a report to be issued by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness subcommittee which will advance strong military arguments against the proposed ban on all except underground nuclear tests.

Another is the stand taken against the treaty by Senator Russell (D., Ga.), powerful chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Russell's opposition is considered a blow to Administration hopes for an impressively overwhelming Senate indorsement of Mr. Kennedy's most important initiative in foreign affairs.

Others Opposed

The Georgia Democrat has been joined already by such treaty foes as Senators Goldwater (R., Ariz.), Stennis (D., Miss.), Eastland (D., Miss.), Robertson (D., Va.), and Tower (R., Texas).

These men had been expected to fight the test ban. More troubling to the Administration is the prospect that Russell could sway wavering senators whose votes—like his—had been doubtful.

But even the most pessimistic leadership estimate on the eve of the treaty debate still takes the number of opposition votes at no more than 24—10 less than the number required to kill the treaty if all senators are present.

There were some senators, however, who were predicting that only eight or ten votes would be cast against the treaty.

While the Administration was faced with the opposition of Russell and other Democrats it received a measure of support this weekend from influential Republicans.

Dirksen reported that former President Eisenhower was against any formal reservations to the treaty that would require renegotiation.

During the hearings on the test ban, Mr. Eisenhower had informed the Foreign Relations Committee that he was concerned whether the agreement might prevent the United States from using nuclear weapons in outbreaks of hostilities that threatened American security.

This was interpreted at the time to mean that the former President wanted the Senate to attach a formal reservation underscoring the prerogative to use nuclear weapons in wartime.

Dirksen explained that Mr. Eisenhower had in mind only "an unequivocal assurance from proper sources" rather than a Senate reservation to the treaty.

In another GOP development, Senator Saltonstall (R., Mass.), ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, announced that he would vote for ratification of the treaty.

Saltonstall, who also is chairman of the Republican Conference, thus went even farther than Dirksen and Senator Hickenlooper (R., Iowa), ranking GOP member on the Foreign Relations Committee and chairman of the Republic Policy Committee.

Approval Expected

Hickenlooper has announced that he would vote for the treaty unless a more substantial case is made to prove it detrimental to national security. Dirksen has said that a meeting ten days ago with high Administration officials resolved many of his doubts about the pact.

Today Senator Dodd (D., Conn.) made a move to head off Senate reservations on the treaty by proposing that the Senate incorporate "statements of understanding" in its ratification resolution.

Although Dodd's "understandings" would not send bargainers back to the negotiating table, some Senate sources said they might create international problems.

"Understandings" Listed

Dodd would have the Senate declare that the treaty:

1. Did not involve diplomatic recognition of Communist East Germany.
2. Did not limit the use of nuclear weapons in the event of armed hostilities.
3. Did not require the United States to observe the 90-day withdrawal clause if the Russians violate the treaty.
4. Could not be amended without Senate approval.
5. Would not prohibit peaceful atomic energy projects such as second round across the Central

Test-Day Debate Seen

During the coming debate, which will last ten days or more, the Senate will be the arena for the most intensive discussion of international and military affairs since the Kennedy administration took office.

As an effort to ease world tensions, the proposed ban on all nuclear tests except those underground is considered the most important agreement since the United Nations was formed at the end of World War II.

Equal NATO Pact

And as a document vitally affecting this nation's security, the treaty has assumed the importance of the NATO pact of 1949.

Hearings conducted and speeches made during the past four weeks, in their decorum and gravity, have shown that the Senate is aware of its almost unique responsibilities.

Britain, with its tight parliamentary discipline, and the Soviet Union, with its centralized dictatorship, approved the treaty for all practical purposes at the time of signing in Moscow August 5.

But under the American system, a President cannot ratify a treaty until the Senate gives its advice and consent by a two-thirds vote. Moreover, the Senate has the power, by straight majority vote, to attach amendments or reservations to a treaty, which can force renegotiations.

League Pact Rejected

The world learned about Senate prerogatives negatively and positively—when the League of Nations was rejected in 1919 and the United Nations was approved a world war later.

According to most head counts, the test-ban treaty will find the Senate in an affirmative mood again.

Early in the hearings Senator Fulbright (D., Ark.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, predicted that no more — and probably less — than twenty senators would vote nay.

Although the treaty has provoked thousands of pages of testimony, it is a short document. In essence it bans its signatories not to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space and underwater. Underground testing will be permitted, and a nation can withdraw after a 90-day notice.

Despite the apparent simplicity, the pact raises questions that have divided the nation's foremost scientists and military men and, in coming days, will lead to vehement arguments in the Senate.

Will the treaty help or hinder national security?

The Administration says the Russians will be put to such heavy expense in testing underground that American nuclear superiority will be prolonged. Treaty opponents doubt whether we have superiority even today in vital areas like antimissile defense, and they believe only the Russians will benefit.

Three Points Made

Will the treaty stop the nuclear arms race?

Administration officials make three points—first, that our weapons production will continue; second, that the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations will be curbed; third, that international conditions may be improved by the treaty to an extent that arms control is feasible. Treaty opponents warn that the United States may relax its efforts while the Communists continue arming for world conquest.

Will the treaty be effective?

Proponents insist that the pact is self-policing in that all but the smallest above-ground explosions are certain to be detected. Opponents hold that the greatest danger lies not in clandestine testing but in secret Soviet preparations for a new—and possibly decisive—test series after a sudden abrogation of the treaty.

These and other issues will be debated at length in the days ahead. Senators will be talking about the effect of the treaty on the Sino-Soviet feud, on the solidarity of the Western alliance, on complex technical developments in nuclear weaponry and on radioactive fallout and its impact.